

Business Notices.

IMPORTANT FACTS.

Constant writing for six months is done cheaper with Gold Pens than with Steel Pens; therefore, it is economy to use Gold Pens.

The Gold Pen remains unchanged by years of continued use, while the Steel Pen is ever changing by corrosion and wear, therefore, perfect uniformity of writing is obtained only by the use of the Gold Pen.

The Gold Pen is always ready and reliable, while the Steel Pen must be often condemned and a new one selected; therefore there is great saving of time in the use of the Gold Pen.

Gold is capable of receiving any degree of elasticity, so that the Gold Pen is exactly adapted to the hand of the writer, therefore, the nerves of the hand and arm are not injured, as is known to be the case by the use of Steel Pens.

See "The Pen is mightier than the Sword," in another column.

WINTER CLOTHING.—The cheapest, the best assortment, newest styles, best styles, &c., &c.
F. L. BALDWIN,
Nos. 70 and 72 Bowery.

NEATLY DECORATED FRENCH CHINA.
DINING SETS, at \$70 and upward.
NEATLY DECORATED FRENCH CHINA.
TEA SETS, at \$45 and upward.
GRANDLIERES and GAS FIXTURES.
E. V. HADGROVE & CO.,
Nos. 430, 432, and 434 Broadway, corner of Broome-st.

TRUSSES.—MARSH & CO.'S RADICAL CURE.
Tons, No. 2 Vestal-st. All kinds of Trusses, Supporters (Military Shoulder Braces and Abdominal Supporters combined) Elastic Stockings and Mechanical Appliances for Deformities. A female attends ladies.

BURDICK'S WINDOW BLIND SLAT LOCK.
holds Slat in any desired position, and locks them when shut.
J. W. BROWN, Agent, No. 57 Broadway.

All articles for Soldiers at Baltimore, Washington, and all other places, should be sent by HARRISON'S EXPRESS, No. 74 Broadway, as they charge only half rates. Their Army Express daily, at 12:30 and 4:45 p. m.

New-York Daily Tribune

MONDAY, DECEMBER 2, 1861.

The Secretary of the Navy approves of the action of Capt. Wilkes in seizing the Rebel Commissioners Mason and Slidell, and says he might have captured the vessel bearing them.

Our Washington correspondent states that, on the urgent request of George D. Prentice, of the Louisville Journal, Calhoun Benham and Senator Gwin are to be, or have been, released from Fort Lafayette by Secretary Seward.

We print on the 6th page of this morning's paper a full report of the great Opdyke meeting held on Saturday evening in and about the Cooper Institute. The account also includes a report of Mr. Opdyke's remarks in response to the greeting of a throng of friends.

Some anxiety has been expressed lest the Nashville, last heard from at Southampton, just after having done a deed of shameless piracy, should molest the steamship Arago, and perchance capture Gen. Scott and Mr. Thurlow Wood. It is hardly necessary to use words in showing the groundlessness of these fears. The Arago carries four rifled cannon of long range, has a large number of small arms, and can be defended by a crew of 100 men. The Nashville will not be too ready to attack such an antagonist.

We have not desired nor intended to introduce party questions into the Mayoralty election; but our antagonists will not have it so. While no man has the assurance or the baseness to question either the eminent abilities or the eminent personal character of GEORGE OPDYKE, he is assailed with bitterness and malignity, both by Fernando Wood and the orators of Tammany Hall, simply on the ground that he is a Republican and does not love that accursed institution of Slavery, whose chief managers have set on foot this most atrocious rebellion! When Mr. Opdyke is thus wickedly and causelessly assailed, every fair-minded man, no matter what his politics, should come to the rescue, but above all every man who has fought with him for the same cherished principles, Republicans! Let your presence at the polls to-morrow, and your votes, prove that you are not extinguished. Give a crushing response to both Wood and Tammany Hall!

THE LATEST WAR NEWS.

We were made to say on Saturday that Tybee Island was within easy mortar range of Savannah. Of course we intended to say that it was so near Fort Pulaski, thus menacing Savannah.

Our news from the Coast of Georgia this morning, though not full, is highly satisfactory, not to say exhilarating. Tattall—"Old Tattall," as he is irreverently called by our officers—some days ago gave out word that he was going down with his fleet (!) "to drive the Hessians off." By Hessians, he meant the squadron of Union vessels which had landed men on Tybee Island. We now learn that he did go down; but he appears to have found "the Hessians" too much for him. So he retired, as the Secession papers moderately state it. He has shown a retiring disposition more than once lately. Beyond this, we have little news. We learn that the rebels have sunk two vessels between Tybee Island and Fort Pulaski, in order to guard Savannah from attack.

From Port Royal we have not much information. The Bienville, from New-York, reached there on Wednesday last. Gen. Sherman returned the same day from his excursion to Tybee Island. The fleet which remained at Hilton Head, fitting out for a fresh expedition, expected its orders by the Bienville. Benafort is still unoccupied by the Union troops, though officers daily visit the town. There had been no engagement between our troops and the Rebels. The negroes do not show any surprising alacrity in coming forward to work; their liberty is so new and delightful to them that they have enough to do to enjoy it.

We are still without satisfactory intelligence from Pensacola. News we have, but it is from Southern papers, and is as confused as it is bombastic. Such as it is, we publish it this morning. The Pensacola Observer of the 22d, says that on the morning of that day Fort Pickens opened fire upon the Rebel steamer, Times, with little effect; that the Rebel batteries returned the fire; and that the Niagara was trying to cross the

bar, but was unable to do so. The same paper the next day states that many shot and shell from the fort fell within the Navy Yard, but that very little damage was done. A dispatch to The Richmond Enquirer, dated at Pensacola last Tuesday, says that everything in that vicinity is quiet; that the Union fleet keeps at a safe distance; and that Bragg thirsts for a renewal of the fight. The Southern papers devote much space to abuse of Col. Brown for an alleged act which they denounce as barbarous. They say that he fired upon the rebel hospital, or that he threatened so to do. The truth of the case seems to be this: The rebels hoisted a yellow flag on a certain building, signifying that it was a hospital; they, however, made sand batteries at its foot. When they begged Col. Brown not to fire upon this building, he immediately assented on condition that they should not use their batteries just spoken of. If he fired upon this house with the yellow flag, it can have been only because their act of attacking him with guns planted under its shelter showed that they were guilty of a mean subterfuge, and that the hospital was not there.

A spy, who has just returned to our Potomac camps from Richmond, says that the most intense excitement exists, not only at that place, but through the entire South, by reason of our naval expeditions. The Rebel troops from the threatened States declare that they will go home, and large numbers of them have already started. Among the Georgia, South Carolina, and Louisiana very great restlessness, amounting almost to violent mutiny, showed itself, and was only partially quieted by the promise made by Jeff. Davis that men enough should be sent South not only to defend their homes, but to drive the "rascally Yankees" into the sea. It is said, by the same authority, that the Rebels feel inclined to leave Virginia soil and allow the Union troops to take possession of it. They find it too costly to keep an army in that State.

On the Potomac the Rebels are making frequent advances of scouting parties; this is done, as it is thought, for the purpose of covering the retreat of the main army from Manassas. At present, however, this is mere conjecture.

A scout, who has followed the army of Price since the evacuation of Springfield, Mo., says that they, 15,000 strong, are moving north in three columns. The right wing, 6,000, was at Stockton, Cedar County; the left wing, 4,000, under Gen. Rains, was near Nevada, Vernon County. Price, himself, with 5,000 men, held the center, and was near Monticello, in the latter county. Price's intention is to march into Kansas, and the line was taken up on the 26th ult. He ordered McCulloch to follow him. This order the latter disregarded, and he is now going to Arkansas.

Gen. Price wants 50,000 men. He says so. He writes a long and most urgent proclamation, calling for that number. In this document, published in our columns, he complains bitterly that six months after a call from the Governor for 50,000 men only 5,000 have shown themselves, and this, too, out of a population of 300,000. Having stated this fact, which he seems to regard as a humiliating thing, he becomes highly poetical, and culminates in a poetical quotation from "Marco Bozzaris": "his effort concludes splendidly thus: 'Do I hear your shouts? Is that your war cry which echoes through the land? Are you coming, fifty thousand men? Missouri shall move to victory with the tread of a giant. Come on, my brave fifty thousand heroes! Gallant, unconquerable Southern men, we await your coming.' Price waiting for his fifty thousand will be an object of curiosity to the traveler in Missouri for a long time to come.

Our Consul at Paramaribo reports that he has information of the pirate Sumter, which was on an island near Curacao; it is not known whether this means that the pirate was wrecked or not, but the second item of the dispatch strengthens that supposition, being as follows: That the crew were sailing about in boats. The public will take all reports about the Sumter with due allowance for errors of fact.

The rebel pirate Royal Yacht has been captured off Galveston by the frigate Santee.

TO CANDID CITIZENS.

Two years ago, our City elected a Mayor, while a large majority of its citizens were mainly solicitous for the defeat of Fernando Wood, and ready to support any honest and capable citizen who would be most likely to defeat him. We Republicans had supported a Tammany Democrat against him at the preceding election of Mayor, and were fairly entitled to a return of the favor. But no—the Tammany Democrats would support no one but a Democrat—they would not even agree to divide the ticket with us and give us the Corporation Council and Alms-House Governor if we would support their candidate for Mayor. All their fine words amounted at last to this—that they would run a clean Tammany ticket, and we might vote for it or let Wood be elected.

We of THE TRIBUNE, with over Twenty Thousand Republicans, thought this unreasonable and humiliating—thought we were entitled to some voice in naming the candidates whom our votes were required to elect—thought that, after our sore experience with Tiemann, we were entitled to be treated otherwise than as dogs. But The N. Y. Times, The Sun, The Express, and most of the Sunday papers, fairly yelled us down, frightening their easy-going readers with the constant iteration that we were only running Opdyke for the sake of electing Wood. They thus drew off from Opdyke thousands of Republican votes—and elected Wood! Look at the Official Returns:

Republican. Tammany. Mozart.
Mayor...Opdyke, 21,417 Havemeyer, 20,912 Wood, 29,940
Council...Hall, 21,651 Tilden, 23,759 Brown, 32,272
A. H. Com. Pinkney, 27,156 McElroy, 21,463 Lynch, 23,269

These votes tell their own story. Pinkney and McElroy ran the real strength of the Republican and Tammany parties respectively. Had the indifferent or moderate in politics concentrated their suffrages on Opdyke instead of Havemeyer, Wood's reign would then have ended. But they were stunned by a per-

nal vociferation that Havemeyer could beat Wood, but Opdyke could not, and so took the very course to insure Wood's election.

In November, 1860, the three parties again tried their strength at the polls. Now there was no pretense of running this way or that in order to beat Wood; each party put forward its own candidates and gave them all their votes. See the Official Results:

Republican. Tammany. Mozart.
Register...Keyser, 24,615 Bennett, 25,777 Lynch, 31,457
Brooklyn...Van Rensselaer, 26,110 Hoffman, 29,966 Russell, 17,967
Superior...J. White, 21,714 Upholder, 33,136 Tilden, 23,269
Superior...Stewart, 33,134 Fly, 20,519 Schwab, 26,548

Here, in every instance where party lines were tightly drawn, the Republican candidates triumphed over both the warring Democratic factions. McCunn was chosen City Judge and West Surrogate by having both the Tammany and Mozart nominations, and Hoffman Recorder by a defection of Ten Thousand Wood men from the support of Russell; but in no case did either faction beat the Republican when the other polled its own vote.

Our late Election, though parties were much out of proved a like state of facts. In no single case was a Republican beaten by a Tammany candidate when the party lines were tightly drawn. Look at the Official figures:

Republican. Tammany. Mozart.
Superior...Blunt, 29,919 Farley, 20,919 Kuster, 14,972
Council...Naumann, 23,264 Jackson, 16,824 Ferris, 16,824
Barney...23,464 Douglas, 15,145 Galpin, 16,829
Whitely...20,910 Elcker, 14,354 Hughes, 15,801
Collins...18,772 McConl, 14,267 Wright, 14,277

The votes for Sheriff, District-Attorney, County Clerk, and Marine Court, prove nothing, simply because the Tammany and Mozart candidates for Clerk were the same, while a large portion of the Republicans voted for the "People's Union" and "Independent" candidates. But no intelligent politician can look over the figures and fail to see that the Republican vote was stronger than the Tammany. Purdy received not less than Three Thousand Mozart votes; yet he beats Blunt less than Six Hundred. Our four Coroners beat the Tammany not less than Five Thousand average majority; yet Mr. Opdyke has relatively the support of quite as many of the non-political organizations as our Coroners had, and for most excellent reasons.

What mean, then, the pretenses that Republicans must desert their own most fit and worthy candidate and support a Democrat in order to defeat Wood? It is not an honest reason, but a dodge, a make-believe. Any man has a right to vote as he sees fit, but no man has a moral right to seek to influence the votes of others by fraud. The Republican party is certainly stronger than the Tammany, as the above figures demonstrate; and the talk of going for Gunther to beat Wood, is a sore-headed device for achieving personal ends and revengeful supposed personal grievances. Must we always thus grind in the prison-house of our enemies? How can we hope ever to be in the ascendant here if we throw away every chance of triumph that is freely proffered us?

There remains a ground of strength for Opdyke which every politician will appreciate: Neither of the Democratic factions can afford to be beaten by the other. If Tammany Hall is beaten by Wood, his faction will properly be regarded as the regular Democracy of our City; and Tammany will be no where; if Wood is beaten by Gunther, he is under foot ever more; but if Opdyke is elected, the two factions will stand on an equal footing, and their masses will unite against the Republicans hereafter, and force the leaders to do likewise. Those leaders understand this as well as we do; and they will act on their knowledge. Whichever faction is behind at 2 o'clock to-morrow must take care that the other is not the victor, whoever may be. Wise men will understand this, and see what result it foreshadows.

WOOD A MAN OF NERVE.

It will doubtless be very generally remembered that Fernando Wood issued a lithographic circular just previous to the Charter Election, two years ago, announcing himself as "a candidate for the Mayoralty," which he thrust under the door of every honest man in New-York. In that circular he made promises of good behavior in the administration of city affairs, with the liberality of a repentant thief. He was to have a "single eye" to the welfare of the city, and to convince the voters that he was quite in earnest, disposed of one of his eyes by way of improvement on Webster, in the word Mayoralty. He was elected, while receiving a decided minority of the votes cast. We have had two years more of his rule, and we have also the Hackley contract, and many other big and little swindles of the same character.

F. Wood, esq., has issued another circular, with which he has flooded the city, using in the present case the name of a certain, or uncertain, Clinton Rowe, instead of his own magnificent sig. This lithographic appeal is in the following words:

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, November, 1861.
DEAR SIR: In times like these no man should be Mayor who has not nerve, ability, and experience. This city is in danger, and it will be imprudent to change our present Mayor for an untried one. Let us select him! I enclose a few tickets. By order,
CLINTON ROWE, Chairman.

A man of nerve enough! Well, Fernando has nerve of a certain kind. Who but he would have the nerve to draw and appropriate another's money, which had been placed to his (Wood's) credit by mistake? Who but he would have the nerve necessary to swindle his brother-in-law and partner in business, by false entries and other devices only resorted to by shameless knaves? Who else has the nerve necessary to defy the laws of the State and resort to violence and bloodshed, in the desperate hope of thus retaining the power which he had so shamelessly abused? Who else has the nerve to deliberately propose in a message the violent Secession of the city from the State, and its alliance with the rebellious enemies of the Government? Who but Fernando Wood has the nerve necessary to say to the Rebels of Georgia that if he had the power they might freely take from this city guns and other munitions of war necessary for carrying on a wicked and gigantic rebellion against the United States? Who but the placid Fernando could summon the nerve necessary

to nominate candidates for Judges, lay such candidates under contribution for election expenses, and then use their money for the election of their opponents? Who else the nerve to originate and carry on a public swindle so gigantic in its proportions as the Hackley street-sweeping contract? Who else the nerve to proclaim himself a rebel and a traitor to his country? Who but Wood, being guilty of all these crimes, and many more, would have the nerve not only to show himself in the vicinity of honest men, but to ask their suffrages for the best office in their gift and the unbounded, unblushing impudence to present himself before the public as a burning and shining light of virtue, integrity, honor, straightforwardness and loyalty?

GUNTHER EXPOSED.

On the 19th of February last, the day Mr. Lincoln arrived in this city, en route for Washington, Mr. Christian Godfrey Gunther, now a candidate for Mayor, and professing to be a warm Union man, went into the publication office of The New-York Sun, and wrote an advertisement at the counter, in substance as follows:

THE UNEMPLOYED WORKINGMEN and LABORERS of the city are requested to meet at 11 o'clock this morning, in the City Hall Park, to demand of the President, a remedy for their want of employment and want of food, consequent upon the troubles brought upon the country by his election.

This advertisement, as we learn from those who were present, was refused by the person in charge of The Sun advertising department, on the ground that it was seditious, and would lead to a riot, and The Sun would not lend itself to any such proceeding. Mr. Gunther was advised to keep his money and not to make a fool of himself. Whereupon he took his advertisement and said he would get it into The Herald. It would thus appear that Mr. Gunther, who now plumes himself upon his Unionist and conservative character, endeavored to stir up a mob at the City Hall levee of President Lincoln. Had he succeeded in rousing the bad passions of the mob, who knows but it might possibly have anticipated the diabolical attempt upon the President's life which the Secession ruffians of Baltimore had conspired to make on his passage through that city! Republicans, and loyal men of New-York! these facts are unquestionable, and can be proved by a number of witnesses. How much better is he than Fernando Wood? Will you either directly or indirectly favor the election of such a man to the Mayoralty?

UNCLE JOE.

To the Editor of The N. Y. Tribune.
SIR: The article in your paper of this morning referring to me requires a response, for the simple reason that the statement with which it commences, and upon which it wholly depends, is without foundation.

As you stated that what fact or circumstance suggested my statement, I say "I have gone over to the Tammany Democrats." I can imagine no other than the announcement in the papers of my expected speaking at a meeting to be held this evening of citizens irrespective of party in favor of the election of Mr. Gunther to the office of Mayor.

Whether or not such a circumstance fairly suggests to any fair man that I have "gone over to the Tammany Democrats," and justifies the residue of the article, I willingly leave to the determination of your readers.

I have strangely misapprehended THE TRIBUNE if it has not persistently discouraged partisan feeling and action in the elections held since the outbreak of the infamous rebellion now raging. I certainly have been encouraged and sustained in the course I have pursued, and intend to pursue in this respect by my daily personal of your journal.

While I have, and may again, turn away from men in the Republican party, I never can be driven away from my duty and support of the principles of that party.

In these times I acknowledge no obligation to vote in a purely local election for one man rather than another because that one man is a Republican, and I shall support Mr. Gunther for Mayor because I deem it my duty so to do.

Whether or not I shall be replied or blamed for so doing, cannot affect my conviction of duty, or my determination to act upon such conviction. Yours, respectfully,
JOSEPH HOXIE.

Response by The Tribune.

New-York, Nov. 30, 1861.

Mr. Hoxie's imagination, however lively and erratic, did not mislead him in the premises. We inferred that he had "gone over to the Tammany Democrats" from the simple fact that he was consorting and colleging with them on street-corners and in their private junketings—was largely boasted of by their blowers as a great accession to their camp—his name was blazing on their handbills in letters as large as a stove—and he was about to make a speech at their great City meeting. Was not this enough—apart from the fact that he had recently been a Republican candidate successively for two important offices, and had failed to secure either—to justify our inference that he had gone over to Tammany Hall?

Mr. Hoxie says we have urged the selection of candidates in this National crisis without regard to party politics. You never spoke a truer word, old friend! and do you happen to know why candidates are not so selected? Our Republican State Committee, representing a large majority of the people of our State, invited the Democratic minority to meet us in State Convention and select a ticket of good and true patriots for State officers regardless of party politics. Their intent was to have this principle carried through all our elections. But they were repelled by the Democratic General Committee, in which Tammany Hall was and is represented—their courteous and generous proposition not civilly declined but rejected with insult! They held a party Convention, wherein Tammany Hall was fully represented, and not merely nominated a straight party ticket, but passed the following resolution:

"Resolved, That while we admit the necessity of summary processes and martial law among insurgent populations and within the lines of military operations, we protest against the doctrine that any law except the Federal Constitution and the rights of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—against the right of the Federal Government to organize systems of State Police—against the assumption of the Federal Executive to suspend the writ of Habeas Corpus for civil offenses. We protest against the assumption of the Executive power to establish a system of passports—